

AN IDEAL-BASED COZERO-DIVISOR GRAPH OF A COMMUTATIVE RING

H. ANSARI-TOROGHY, F. FARSHADIFAR, AND F. MAHBOOBI-ABKENAR

ABSTRACT. Let R be a commutative ring and let I be an ideal of R . In this paper, we introduce the cozero-divisor graph $\hat{\Gamma}_I(R)$ of R and obtain some related results.

1. INTRODUCTION

Let R be a commutative ring with non-zero identity and let $Z(R)$ be the set of all zero-divisors of R . Anderson and Livingston, in [2], introduced the *zero-divisor graph of R* , denoted by $\Gamma(R)$, as the (undirected) graph with vertices $Z^*(R) = Z(R) \setminus \{0\}$ and for two distinct elements x and y in $Z^*(R)$, the vertices x and y are adjacent if and only if $xy = 0$.

In [10], Redmond introduced the definition of the zero-divisor graph with respect to an ideal. Let I be an ideal of R . The *zero-divisor graph of R with respect to I* , denoted by $\Gamma_I(R)$, is the graph whose vertices are the set $\{x \in R \setminus I \mid xy \in I \text{ for some } y \in R \setminus I\}$ with distinct vertices x and y are adjacent if and only if $xy \in I$. Thus if $I = 0$, then $\Gamma_I(R) = \Gamma(R)$, and I is a non-zero prime ideal of R if and only if $\Gamma_I(R) = \emptyset$.

In [1], Afkhami and Khashayarmanesh introduced the *cozero-divisor graph* $\hat{\Gamma}(R)$ of R , in which the vertices are precisely the nonzero, non-unit elements of R , denoted by $W^*(R)$, and two distinct vertices x and y are adjacent if and only if $x \notin yR$ and $y \notin xR$.

Let I be an ideal of R . In this article, we introduce and study the cozero-divisor graph $\hat{\Gamma}_I(R)$ of R with vertices $\{x \in R \setminus \text{Ann}_R(I) \mid xI \neq I\}$ and two distinct vertices x and y are adjacent if and only if $x \notin yI$ and $y \notin xI$. This is a generalization of cozero-divisor graph introduced in [1] when $I = R$, i.e, we have $\hat{\Gamma}_R(R) = \hat{\Gamma}(R)$. Moreover, this can be regarded the dual notion of ideal-based zero-divisor graph introduced by S.P. Redmond in [10]. Also we obtain some useful information about secondal ideals.

We denote the set of maximal ideals and the Jacobson radical of R by $\text{Max}(R)$ and $J(R)$, respectively. In a graph G , the distance between two distinct vertices a and b , denoted by $d(a, b)$ is the length of the shortest path connecting a and b . If there is not a path between a and b , $d(a, b) = \infty$. The *diameter* of a graph G is $\text{diam}(G) = \sup\{d(a, b) : a \text{ and } b \text{ are distinct vertices of } G\}$. The *girth* of G , is the length of the shortest cycle in G and it is denoted by $g(G)$. If G has no cycle, we define the girth of G to be infinite. An *r -partite graph* is one whose vertex set can be partitioned into r subsets such that no edge has both ends in any one subset.

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 05C75; 13A99; 05C99.

Key words and phrases. Zero-divisor, cozero-divisor, connected, bipartite, secondal ideal.


A *complete r -partite graph* is one each vertex is jointed to every vertex that is not in the same subset. The complete bipartite (i.e, 2-partite) graph with part sizes m and n is denoted by $K_{m,n}$.

2. ON THE GENERALIZATION OF THE COZERO-DIVISOR GRAPH

Definition 2.1. Let R be a commutative ring and let I be an ideal of R . We define *cozero-divisor graph* $\hat{\Gamma}_I(R)$ of R with vertices $\{x \in R \setminus \text{Ann}_R(I) \mid xI \neq I\}$. The distinct vertices x and y are adjacent if and only if $x \notin yI$ and $y \notin xI$. Clearly, when $I = R$ we have $\hat{\Gamma}_I(R) = \hat{\Gamma}(R)$.

Example 2.2. Let $R = \mathbb{Z}_{12}$ and $I = (\bar{3})$. Then $\Gamma_I(R) = \emptyset$. Also, in the following figures we can see the deference between the graphs $\hat{\Gamma}(R)$, $\hat{\Gamma}_I(R)$, and $\Gamma(R)$.

FIGURE 1



Let I be an ideal of R . Then I is said to be a *second ideal* if $I \neq 0$ and for every element r of R we have either $rI = 0$ or $rI = I$.

Lemma 2.3. I is a second ideal of R if and only if $\hat{\Gamma}_I(R) = \emptyset$.

Proof. Straightforward. □

Theorem 2.4. Let I be a proper ideal of R . Then we have the following.

- (a) The graph $\hat{\Gamma}_I(R) \setminus J(R)$ is connected.
- (b) If R is a non-local ring, then $\text{diam}(\hat{\Gamma}_I(R) \setminus J(R)) \leq 2$.

Proof. (a) If R has only one maximal ideal, then $V(\hat{\Gamma}_I(R)) \setminus J(R)$ is the empty set; which is connected. So we may assume that $|\text{Max}(R)| > 1$. Let $a, b \in V(\hat{\Gamma}_I(R)) \setminus J(R)$ be two distinct elements. Without loss of generality, we may assume that $a \in bI$. Since $a \notin J(R)$, there exists a maximal ideal m such that $a \notin m$. We claim that $m \not\subseteq J(R) \cup bI$. Otherwise, $m \subseteq J(R) \cup bI$. This implies that $m \subseteq J(R)$ or $m \subseteq bI$. But $m \neq J(R)$. Hence we have $m \subseteq bI \subsetneq R$, so $m = bI$. This implies that

$a \in m$, a contradiction. Choose the element $c \in m \setminus J(R) \cup bI$. It is easy to check that $a - c - b$.

(b) This follows from part (a). $\square$

Remark 2.5. Figure (B) in Example 2.2 shows that $J(R)$ can not be omitted in Theorem 2.4.

Theorem 2.6. *Let R be a non-local ring and I a proper ideal of R such that for every element $a \in J(R)$, there exists $m \in \text{Max}(R)$ and $b \in m \setminus J(R)$ with $a \notin bR$. Then $\dot{\Gamma}_I(R)$ is connected and $\text{diam}(\dot{\Gamma}_I(R)) \leq 3$.*

Proof. Use the technique of [1, Theorem 2.5]. $\square$

Theorem 2.7. *Let R be a non-local ring and I be a proper ideal of R . Then $g(\dot{\Gamma}_I(R) \setminus J(R)) \leq 5$ or $g(\dot{\Gamma}_I(R) \setminus J(R)) = \infty$.*

Proof. Use the technique of [1, Theorem 2.8] along with Theorem 2.4. $\square$

Theorem 2.8. *Let I be a non-zero ideal of a commutative ring R . If $V(\dot{\Gamma}(R)) \subseteq V(\dot{\Gamma}_I(R))$, then $\text{Ann}_R(I) = 0$ or R is a field (so $I = R$). The converse holds if I is finitely generated.*

Proof. Let $W^*(R) = V(\dot{\Gamma}(R)) \subseteq V(\dot{\Gamma}_I(R))$ and $\text{Ann}_R(I) \neq 0$. Then $W^*(R) \subseteq R \setminus \text{Ann}_R(I)$. Thus $W(R) \cap \text{Ann}_R(I) = \{0\}$. Now suppose contrary that $I \neq R$. Let $0 \neq x \in \text{Ann}_R(I)$ and $y \in W(R)$. Then $xy \in W(R) \cap \text{Ann}_R(I) = \{0\}$ and $x \notin W(R)$. It follows that $y = 0$ and hence $W(R) = \{0\}$. Therefore R is a field. Conversely, if $I = R$ the result is clear. Now suppose that I is a finitely generated ideal of R such that $\text{Ann}_R(I) = 0$ and $x \in V(\dot{\Gamma}(R))$. Then $xI \neq 0$. If $xI = I$, then since I is finitely generated, there exists $t \in R$ such that $(1 + tx)I = 0$ by [9, Theorem 75]. Thus $1 + tx \in \text{Ann}_R(I) = 0$. This implies that $Rx = R$, which is a contradiction. Hence $x \in V(\dot{\Gamma}_I(R))$. Therefore $V(\dot{\Gamma}(R)) \subseteq V(\dot{\Gamma}_I(R))$. $\square$

We will use the following lemma frequently in the sequel.

Lemma 2.9. *Let $I \neq R$ be a finitely generated ideal of R with $\text{Ann}_R(I) = 0$. Then $\dot{\Gamma}(R)$ is a subgraph of $\dot{\Gamma}_I(R)$.*

Proof. By Theorem 2.8 we have $V(\dot{\Gamma}_I(R)) = V(\dot{\Gamma}(R))$. Now let $x, y \in V(\dot{\Gamma}(R)) = V(\dot{\Gamma}_I(R))$ and x is adjacent to y in $\dot{\Gamma}(R)$. Then clearly, they are adjacent in $\dot{\Gamma}_I(R)$. Otherwise, we may assume that $x \in yI$. This implies that $x \in yR$, which is a contradiction. Hence $\dot{\Gamma}(R)$ is a subgraph of $\dot{\Gamma}_I(R)$. $\square$

The following example shows that the inclusion relation between $\dot{\Gamma}_I(R)$ and $\dot{\Gamma}(R)$ in Lemma 2.9 may be a restrict inclusion.

Example 2.10. Let $R := \mathbb{Z}$ and $I := 5\mathbb{Z}$. Then $V(\dot{\Gamma}_I(R)) = V(\dot{\Gamma}(R)) = \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{-1, 0, 1\}$. Now by Lemma 2.9, $\dot{\Gamma}(R)$ is subgraph of $\dot{\Gamma}_I(R)$. However, the elements 2 and 6 are adjacent in $\dot{\Gamma}_I(R)$ but they are not adjacent in $\dot{\Gamma}(R)$.

Theorem 2.11. *Let $I \neq R$ be a finitely generated ideal of R with $\text{Ann}_R(I) = 0$. Suppose that $|\text{Max}(R)| \geq 3$. Then $g(\dot{\Gamma}_I(R)) = 3$.*

Proof. Use the technique of [1, Theorem 2.9]. $\square$

As we mentioned before, $V(\Gamma_I(R)) = \{x \in R \setminus I \mid xy \in I \text{ for some } y \in R \setminus I\}$. We will show this set by $Z_I(R)$. Clearly, for $I = 0$, $Z_I(R) = Z^*(R)$.

Lemma 2.12. Let $I \neq R$ be a finitely generated ideal of R with $\text{Ann}_R(I) = 0$. Then $Z_I(R) \subseteq V(\dot{\Gamma}_I(R))$.

Proof. If $I = 0$, then the claim is clear. So we assume that $I \neq 0$. Now let $x \in Z_I(R)$ then $x \neq 0$ and there exists $y \in R \setminus I$ such that $xy \in I$. Clearly, $xI \neq 0$. Further $xI \neq I$. Otherwise, $xI = I$. Since I is finitely generated, there exists $t \in R$ such that $(1 + tx)I = 0$ by [9, Theorem 75]. This implies that $1 + tx = 0$. So x is a unit element of R and hence $y \in I$, which is a contradiction. Therefore $x \in V(\dot{\Gamma}_I(R))$. $\square$

The next example shows that the inclusion in Lemma 2.12 is not strict in general.

Example 2.13. Let I be a finitely generated ideal of R with $\text{Ann}_R(I) = 0$. Further we assume that R is an Artinian ring with $Z(R) \cap I = 0$. Then we have $V(\dot{\Gamma}_I(R)) = Z_I(R)$. To see this, it is enough to prove that $V(\dot{\Gamma}_I(R)) \subseteq Z_I(R)$ by Lemma 2.12. Let $x \in V(\dot{\Gamma}_I(R))$. Then we have $x \neq 0$ and $xI \neq I$. This implies that $xR \neq R$ and hence x is a non-unit element of R . Since R is Artinian, the set of non-unit elements of R is the same as the set of zero-divisors of R . So $x \in Z(R)$. This shows that $x \notin I$ and there exists $0 \neq y \in R \setminus I$ such that $xy = 0 \in I$. Clearly, $x, y \in Z(R)$. Therefore, $V(\dot{\Gamma}_I(R)) \subseteq Z_I(R)$.

Theorem 2.14. Let I be a finitely generated ideal of R with $\sqrt{I} = I$ and $\text{Ann}_R(I) = 0$. Suppose that $Z_I(R) = V(\dot{\Gamma}_I(R))$. If $\Gamma_I(R)$ is complete, then $\dot{\Gamma}_I(R)$ is also a complete graph.

Proof. Assume on the contrary that $\dot{\Gamma}_I(R)$ is not complete. So there exist $a, b \in V(\dot{\Gamma}_I(R))$ such that $a \notin bI$ or $b \notin aI$. Without loss of generality, we may assume that $a \notin bI$. So, there exists $i \in I$ such that $a = bi$. We claim that i is a unit element. Otherwise, $i \in V(\dot{\Gamma}_I(R))$. Thus we have $i \in V(\dot{\Gamma}_I(R))$ by Lemma 2.9. Hence $i \in Z_I(R)$ by assumption, which is a contradiction. Now $ab = b^2i \in I$. So there exist $i_1 \in I$ such that $b^2i = i_1$. Then $b^2 = i^{-1}i_1 \in I$. Therefore, $b \in \sqrt{I} = I$, a contradiction. $\square$

Proposition 2.15. Let I be a proper ideal of R and $\dot{\Gamma}_I(R)$ a complete bipartite graph with parts $V_i, i = 1, 2$. Then every cyclic ideals $\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b} \subseteq V_i$, for some $i = 1, 2$, are totally ordered.

Proof. Assume on the contrary that there exist ideals aR and bR in V_1 such that $aR \not\subseteq bR$ and $bR \not\subseteq aR$. It follows that $b \notin aR$ and $a \notin bR$. Hence $b \notin aI$ and $a \notin bI$. This means a is adjacent to b , a contradiction. $\square$

Proposition 2.16. Let $I \neq R$ be a finitely generated ideal of R with $\text{Ann}_R(I) = 0$. If the graph $\dot{\Gamma}_I(R) \setminus J(R)$ is n -partite for some positive integer n , then $|Max(R)| \leq n$.

Proof. Assume contrary that $|Max(R)| > n$. Since $\dot{\Gamma}_I(R) \setminus J(R)$ is a n -partite graph and $V(\dot{\Gamma}_I(R)) = V(\dot{\Gamma}_I(R))$ by Lemma 2.9, there exist $m, \acute{m} \in Max(R)$ and $a \in m \setminus \acute{m}, b \in \acute{m} \setminus m$ such that a, b belong to a same part. Clearly, $a \notin bI$ and $b \notin aI$, which is a contradiction. $\square$

For a graph G , let $\chi(G)$ denote the *chromatic number* of the graph G , i.e., the minimal number of colors which can be assigned to the vertices of G in such a way that every two adjacent vertices have different colors. A *clique* of a graph G is

a complete subgraph of G and the number of vertices in the largest clique of G , denoted by $\text{clique}(G)$, is called the *clique number* of G .

Theorem 2.17.

- (1) Let $I \neq R$ be a finitely generated ideal of R with $\text{Ann}_R(I) = 0$. Then if R has infinite member of maximal ideal, then $\text{clique } \dot{\Gamma}_I(R)$ is also infinite; otherwise $\text{clique } (\dot{\Gamma}_I(R)) \geq |\text{Max}(R)|$.
- (2) If $\chi(\dot{\Gamma}_I(R)) < \infty$, then $|\text{Max}(R)| < \infty$.

Proof. (1) This follows from Lemma 2.9 and [1, Theorem 2.14].

(2) Use part (1) along with [1, Theorem 2.14]. $\square$

Theorem 2.18. Let $R = S_1 + S_2$, where S_1 and S_2 are second ideals of R . If $P_1 = \text{Ann}_R(S_1)$ and $P_2 = \text{Ann}_R(S_2)$, then $V(\dot{\Gamma}(R)) = (P_1 \setminus P_2) \cup (P_2 \setminus P_1)$ and $\dot{\Gamma}(R)$ is a complete bipartite graph.

Proof. Let $x \in V(\dot{\Gamma}(R))$, so we have $xR \neq 0$ and $xR \neq R$. Since $xR \neq 0$, $xS_1 \neq 0$ or $xS_2 \neq 0$. First we show that $V(\dot{\Gamma}(R)) = (P_1 \setminus P_2) \cup (P_2 \setminus P_1)$. If $xS_1 \neq 0$, then $x \notin P_1$. So $xS_1 = S_1$. We claim that $xS_2 = 0$. Otherwise, $xS_2 \neq 0$ so that $x \notin P_2$. It means that $xS_2 = S_2$. Thus $xR = R$, a contradiction. So we have $x \in P_2$ hence $x \in (P_2 \setminus P_1) \cup (P_2 \setminus P_1)$. We have similar arguments for reverse inclusion. Now let $x \in P_1 \setminus P_2$ and $y \in P_2 \setminus P_1$. We show that $x \notin yR$ and $y \notin xR$. Otherwise, $x \in yR$ or $y \in xR$. Without loss of generality, $x \in yR$. Then there exists $t \in R$ such that $x = ty$. But $x \notin P_2$ implies that $ty \notin \text{Ann}_R(S_2)$ so that $tyS_2 \neq 0$, a contradiction. Thus, x is adjacent to y . Now we show that x and y can not lie in $P_1 \setminus P_2$ or $P_1 \setminus P_2$. To see this let $x, y \in P_1 \setminus P_2$ and assume that they are adjacent. Then we have $x \notin yR$ and $y \notin xR$. Now by using our assumptions, we conclude that $x \notin xR$, a contradiction. $\square$

Theorem 2.19. Let $I \neq R$ be a finitely generated ideal of R with $\text{Ann}_R(I) = 0$. Assume that $|\text{Max}(R)| \geq 5$. Then $\dot{\Gamma}_I(R)$ is not planar.

Proof. This follows from Lemma 2.9 and [1, Theorem 3.9]. $\square$

Proposition 2.20. Let R be a ring and I be a proper ideal. Then the following hold.

- (a) $V(\Gamma_{\text{Ann}(I)}(R)) \subseteq V(\dot{\Gamma}_I(R))$.
- (b) If R be a reduced ring, then $\Gamma_{\text{Ann}(I)}(R)$ is a subgraph of $\dot{\Gamma}_I(R)$.

Proof. (a) Let $x \in V(\Gamma_{\text{Ann}(I)}(R))$. Then there exists $y \in R \setminus \text{Ann}_R(I)$ such that $xy \in \text{Ann}_R(I)$. We claim that $xI \neq I$. Otherwise, $xI = I$. Then $xyI = yI$ so that $yI = 0$. This implies that $y \in \text{Ann}_R(I)$, a contradiction. Therefore, $V(\Gamma_{\text{Ann}(I)}(R)) \subseteq V(\dot{\Gamma}_I(R))$.

(b) By part (a), $V(\Gamma_{\text{Ann}(I)}(R)) \subseteq V(\dot{\Gamma}_I(R))$. Now we suppose that x is adjacent to y in $\Gamma_{\text{Ann}(I)}(R)$. We show that x is adjacent to y in $\dot{\Gamma}_I(R)$. Otherwise, without loss generality, we assume that $x \in yI$. So that $x^2 \in xyI$. Thus $x^2 = 0$. This implies that $x \in \text{Ann}_R(I)$, a contradiction. $\square$

Proposition 2.21. Let I be a finite generated proper ideal of R . Suppose that $x, y \in R \setminus \text{Ann}_R(I)$.

- (a) $x \in V(\dot{\Gamma}_I(R))$ if and only if $x + \text{Ann}_R(I) \in V(\dot{\Gamma}(R/\text{Ann}_R(I)))$.

- (b) If $x + \text{Ann}_R(I)$ is adjacent to $y + \text{Ann}_R(I)$ in $\dot{\Gamma}(R/\text{Ann}_R(I))$, then x is adjacent to y in $\dot{\Gamma}_I(R)$.

Proof. This is straightforward. $\square$

An R -module M is said to be a *comultiplication module* if for every submodule N of M there exists an ideal I of R such that $N = \text{Ann}_M(I)$, equivalently, for each submodule N of M , we have $N = \text{Ann}_M(\text{Ann}_R(N))$ [4]. R is said to be a *comultiplication ring* if R is a comultiplication R -module.

Theorem 2.22. *Let I be a proper ideal of R . Then $V(\dot{\Gamma}_I(R)) = V(\Gamma_{\text{Ann}(I)}(R))$ if one of the following conditions hold.*

- (a) R is a comultiplication ring.
(b) $R/\text{Ann}_R(I) = Z(R/\text{Ann}_R(I)) \cup U(R/\text{Ann}_R(I))$.

Proof. Clearly $V(\Gamma_{\text{Ann}(I)}(R)) \subseteq V(\dot{\Gamma}_I(R))$.

(a) Let $x \in V(\dot{\Gamma}_I(R))$. Then $xI \neq 0$ and $xI \neq I$. Since R is a comultiplication ring, this implies that $\text{Ann}_R(xI) \neq \text{Ann}_R(I)$. Thus there exists $y \in \text{Ann}_R(xI) \setminus \text{Ann}_R(I)$. Therefore, $x \in V(\Gamma_{\text{Ann}(I)}(R))$.

(b) Let $x \in V(\dot{\Gamma}_I(R))$. Then $xI \neq 0$ and $xI \neq I$. By assumption, $x + \text{Ann}_R(I) \in Z(R/\text{Ann}_R(I))$ or $x + \text{Ann}_R(I) \in U(R/\text{Ann}_R(I))$. If $x + \text{Ann}_R(I) \in Z(R/\text{Ann}_R(I))$, then there exists $y \in R \setminus \text{Ann}_R(I)$ such that $xy \in \text{Ann}_R(I)$. Therefore, $x \in V(\Gamma_{\text{Ann}(I)}(R))$. If $x + \text{Ann}_R(I) \in U(R/\text{Ann}_R(I))$, then there exists $z + \text{Ann}_R(I) \in R/\text{Ann}_R(I)$ such that $xz + \text{Ann}_R(I) = 1 + \text{Ann}_R(I)$. Thus $1 = xz + a$ for some $a \in \text{Ann}_R(I)$. Now we have $I = 1I = (xz + a)I = xzI \subseteq xI$, a contradiction. $\square$

Theorem 2.23. *Let $I \subseteq J$ be non-zero ideals of R . Then we have the following.*

- (a) If $R/\text{Ann}_R(J) = Z(R/\text{Ann}_R(J)) \cup U(R/\text{Ann}_R(J))$, then $V(\dot{\Gamma}_I(R)) \subseteq V(\dot{\Gamma}_J(R))$.
(b) If $\dim(R) = 0$, then $V(\dot{\Gamma}_I(R)) \subseteq V(\dot{\Gamma}_J(R))$. In particular, this holds if R is a finite commutative ring.

Proof. (a) This follows from Theorem 2.22 (b) and [3, Theorem 2.8].

(b) $\dim(R) = 0$ implies that $\dim(R/J) = 0$. It follows that

$$R/\text{Ann}_R(J) = Z(R/\text{Ann}_R(J)) \cup U(R/\text{Ann}_R(J)).$$

Now the result follows from part (a). $\square$

Proposition 2.24. *Let I be a non-zero ideal of a commutative ring R with $R = Z(R) \cup U(R)$ and $V(\dot{\Gamma}_I(R)) = V(\dot{\Gamma}(R))$. Then $\text{Ann}_R(I) = 0$.*

Proof. Suppose that $V(\dot{\Gamma}_I(R)) = V(\dot{\Gamma}(R))$. Since $V(\dot{\Gamma}_I(R)) \subseteq R \setminus \text{Ann}_R(I)$, we have $V(\dot{\Gamma}(R)) \subseteq R \setminus \text{Ann}_R(I)$. Thus $\text{Ann}_R(I) \subseteq R \setminus V(\dot{\Gamma}(R)) = \{0\} \cup U(R)$ by hypothesis. Therefore, $\text{Ann}_R(I) = 0$. $\square$

3. SECONDAL IDEALS

In this section, we will study the ideal-based cozero-divisor graph with respect to secondal ideals.

The element $a \in R$ is called *prime to an ideal I* of R if $ra \in I$ (where $r \in R$) implies that $r \in I$. The set of elements of R which are not prime to I is denoted by $S(I)$. A proper ideal I of R is said to be *primal* if $S(I)$ is an ideal of R [8].

A non-zero submodule N of an R -module M is said to be *secondal* if $W_R(N) = \{a \in R : aN \neq N\}$ is an ideal of R [5]. A *secondal ideal* is defined similarly when $N = I$ is an ideal of R . In this case, we say I is *P -secondal*, where $P = W(I)$ is a prime ideal of R .

Lemma 3.1. Let I be a non-zero ideal of R . Then the following hold.

- (a) $\text{Ann}_R(I) \subseteq W(I)$.
- (b) $Z_R(R/\text{Ann}_R(I)) \subseteq W(I)$.
- (c) $V(\dot{\Gamma}_I(R)) = W(I) \setminus \text{Ann}_R(I)$. In particular, $V(\dot{\Gamma}_I(R)) \cup \text{Ann}_R(I) = W(I)$.
- (d) If $\text{Ann}_R(I)$ is a radical ideal of R , then $\bigcup_{P \in \text{Min}(\text{Ann}_R(I))} P \subseteq W(I)$.

Proof. (a) Let $r \in \text{Ann}_R(I)$. Then $rI = 0 \neq I$. Thus $r \in W(I)$.

(b) Let $x \in Z_R(R/\text{Ann}_R(I))$ and $x \notin W(I)$. Then there exists $y \in R \setminus \text{Ann}_R(I)$ such that $xyI = 0$. Hence $xI = I$ implies that $yI = 0$, a contradiction.

(c) Let $r \in V(\dot{\Gamma}_I(R))$. Then $r \in R \setminus \text{Ann}_R(I)$ and $rI \neq I$; hence $r \in W(I) \setminus \text{Ann}_R(I)$. Thus $V(\dot{\Gamma}_I(R)) \subseteq W(I) \setminus \text{Ann}_R(I)$. Conversely, we assume that $x \in W(I) \setminus \text{Ann}_R(I)$. So $xI \neq I$ and $xI \neq 0$. Then $x \in V(\dot{\Gamma}_I(R))$, so we have equality.

(d) By [9, Exer 13, page 63], $Z_R(R/I) = \bigcup_{P \in \text{Min}(I)} P$, where I is a radical ideal of R . Thus $Z_R(R/\text{Ann}_R(I)) = \bigcup_{P \in \text{Min}(\text{Ann}_R(I))} P$. Hence $\bigcup_{P \in \text{Min}(\text{Ann}_R(I))} P \subseteq W(I)$ by part (b). $\square$

Remark 3.2. Let $R = \mathbb{Z}$, $I = 2\mathbb{Z}$. Then $Z_R(R/\text{Ann}_R(I)) = Z_R(R) = 0$ and $W(I) = \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{-1, 1\}$. Therefore the converse of part (b) of the above lemma is not true in general.

Proposition 3.3. Let I and P be ideals of R with $\text{Ann}_R(I) \subseteq P$. Then I is a P -secondal ideal of R if and only if $V(\dot{\Gamma}_I(R)) = P \setminus \text{Ann}_R(I)$.

Proof. Straightforward. $\square$

Theorem 3.4. Let I be an ideal of R . Then I is a secondal ideal of R if and only if $V(\dot{\Gamma}_I(R)) \cup \text{Ann}_R(I)$ is an (prime) ideal of R .

Proof. Let I be a secondal ideal. Then $W(I)$ is a prime ideal and by Lemma 3.1(c) $V(\dot{\Gamma}_I(R)) \cup \text{Ann}_R(I) = W(I)$. Thus $V(\dot{\Gamma}_I(R)) \cup \text{Ann}_R(I)$ is an ideal of R . Conversely, suppose that $V(\dot{\Gamma}_I(R)) \cup \text{Ann}_R(I)$ is a (prime) ideal. Then by Lemma 3.1(c), $V(\dot{\Gamma}_I(R)) \cup \text{Ann}_R(I) = W(I)$ is a prime ideal. Hence I is a secondal ideal. $\square$

Theorem 3.5. Let I and J be P -secondal ideals of R . Then $V(\dot{\Gamma}_I(R)) = V(\dot{\Gamma}_J(R))$ if and only if $\text{Ann}_R(I) = \text{Ann}_R(J)$.

Proof. By Lemma 3.1 (a), $\text{Ann}_R(I) \subseteq P$ and $\text{Ann}_R(J) \subseteq P$. It then follows from Proposition 3.3 that $V(\dot{\Gamma}_I(R)) = V(\dot{\Gamma}_J(R))$ if and only if $P \setminus \text{Ann}_R(I) = P \setminus \text{Ann}_R(J)$; and this holds if and only if $\text{Ann}_R(I) = \text{Ann}_R(J)$. $\square$

Lemma 3.6. Let N be a secondary submodule of an R -module M . Then $\sqrt{\text{Ann}_R(N)} = W(N)$.

Proof. Let $x \in W(N)$. Then $xN \neq N$. Since N is a secondary R -module, there exists a positive integer n such that $x^n N = 0$. Thus $x \in \sqrt{\text{Ann}_R(N)}$. Hence $W(I) \subseteq \sqrt{\text{Ann}_R(N)}$. To see the reverse inclusion, let $x \in \sqrt{\text{Ann}_R(N)}$ and $x \notin W(N)$. Then $x^n N = 0$ for some positive integer n and $xN = N$. Therefore $N = 0$, a contradiction. $\square$

Theorem 3.7. *Let I be an ideal of R . Then I is secondary ideal if and only if $V(\dot{\Gamma}_I(R)) = \sqrt{\text{Ann}_R(I)} \setminus \text{Ann}_R(I)$.*

Proof. If I is secondary, then $\sqrt{\text{Ann}_R(I)} = W(I)$ by Lemma 3.6. Hence I is a $\sqrt{\text{Ann}_R(I)}$ -secondal ideal of R . Then Proposition 3.3 implies that $V(\dot{\Gamma}_I(R)) = \sqrt{\text{Ann}_R(I)} \setminus \text{Ann}_R(I)$. Conversely, suppose that $x \in R, xI \neq I$, and $x \notin \sqrt{\text{Ann}_R(I)}$. Then $x \in W(I)$ and $x \notin \text{Ann}_R(I)$. Thus $x \in V(\dot{\Gamma}_I(R))$ and so $x \in \sqrt{\text{Ann}_R(I)} \setminus \text{Ann}_R(I)$ by assumption, a contradiction. $\square$

Definition 3.8. Let I be an ideal of R . We say that an ideal J of R is *second* to I if $IJ = I$.

Proposition 3.9. Let I be an ideal of R . If I is not secondal, then there exist $x, y \in V(\dot{\Gamma}_I(R))$ such that $\langle x, y \rangle$ is second to I .

Proof. Suppose that I is an ideal of R such that it is not secondal. Then by Lemma 3.1 (c), $V(\dot{\Gamma}_I(R)) \cup \text{Ann}_R(I) = W(I)$ is not an ideal of R , so there exist $x, y \in W(I)$ with $x - y \notin W(I)$ and so $(x - y)I = I$. Hence $\langle x, y \rangle I = I$. Now we claim that $x, y \notin \text{Ann}_R(I)$. Otherwise, we have $x \in \text{Ann}_R(I)$ or $y \in \text{Ann}_R(I)$. If $x, y \in \text{Ann}_R(I)$, then $x - y \in \text{Ann}_R(I) \subseteq W(I)$, a contradiction. If $x \in \text{Ann}_R(I)$ and $y \notin \text{Ann}_R(I)$, then $I = (x - y)I \subseteq xI + yI = 0 + yI$, a contradiction. Similarly, we get a contradiction when $x \notin \text{Ann}_R(I)$ and $y \in \text{Ann}_R(I)$. Thus we have $x, y \notin \text{Ann}_R(I)$. $\square$

Proposition 3.10. Let I be an ideal of R . Then the following hold.

- (a) Let x, y be distinct elements of $\sqrt{\text{Ann}_R(I)} \setminus \text{Ann}_R(I)$ with $xy \notin \text{Ann}_R(I)$. Then the ideal $\langle x, y \rangle$ is not second to I .
- (b) If I is a secondary ideal, then the $\text{diam}(\Gamma_{\text{Ann}(I)}(R)) \leq 2$.

Proof. (a) Let ideal $\langle x, y \rangle$ be second to I . Since $x, y \in \sqrt{\text{Ann}_R(I)} \setminus \text{Ann}_R(I)$, there exists the least positive integer n such that $x^n y \in \text{Ann}_R(I)$. As $xy \notin \text{Ann}_R(I)$, we have $n \geq 2$. Let m be the least positive such that $x^{n-1} y^m \in \text{Ann}_R(I)$. Now clearly $m \geq 2$ because $x^{n-1} y \notin \text{Ann}_R(I)$. This yields that the contradiction

$$0 = x^{n-1} y^{m-1} (x, y) I = x^{n-1} y^{m-1} I \neq 0.$$

(b) If I is secondary, then $W(I) = \sqrt{\text{Ann}_R(I)}$ by Lemma 3.7. Choose two distinct vertices x, y in $\Gamma_{\text{Ann}(I)}(R)$. If $xy \in \text{Ann}_R(I)$, then $d(x, y) = 1$. So we assume that $xy \notin \text{Ann}_R(I)$. Then by Proposition 2.20 (a) and Lemma 3.1, $x, y \in W(I) \setminus \text{Ann}_R(I)$. Also we have $x, y \in \sqrt{\text{Ann}_R(I)} \setminus \text{Ann}_R(I)$ by Theorem 3.7. As in the proof of (a), we have the path $x - x^{n-1} y^{m-1} - y$ from x to y in $\Gamma_{\text{Ann}(I)}(R)$. Hence $d(x, y) = 2$. Therefore, $\text{diam}(\Gamma_{\text{Ann}(I)}(R)) \leq 2$. $\square$

REFERENCES

1. M. Afkhami and K. Khashyarmansh, *The cozero-divisor graph of a commutative ring*, South-east Asian Bull. Math., **35** (2011), 753–762.
2. D.F. Anderson and P.S. Livingston, *The zero-divisor graph of a commutative ring*, J. Algebra, **217** (1999), 434–447.
3. D.F. Anderson and S. Shirinkam, *Some remarks on the graph $\Gamma_I(R)$* , Comm. Algebra, **42** (2014), 545–562.
4. H. Ansari-Toroghy and F. Farshadifar, *The dual notion of multiplication modules*, Taiwanese J. Math., **11** (4) (2007), 1189–1201.

5. H. Ansari-Toroghy and F. Farshadifar, *The dual notion of some generalizations of prime submodules*, Comm. Algebra, **39** (2011), 2396-2416.
6. J.A. Bondy and U.S.R. Murty, *Graph theory with applications*, American Elsevier, New York, 1976.
7. S. Ebrahimi Atani and A. Yousefian Darani, *Zero-divisor graphs with respect to primal and weakly primal ideals*, J. Korean Math. Soc., **46** (2009), 313-325.
8. L. Fuchs, *On primal ideals*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc., **1** (1950), 1-6.
9. I. Kaplansky, *Commutative rings*, University of Chicago, 1978.
10. S. P. Redmond, *An ideal-based zero-divisor graph of a commutative ring*, Comm. Algebra, **31** (2003), 4425-4443.
11. A. Yousefian Darani, *Notes on the ideal-based zero-divisor graph*, J. Math. Appl., **32** (2010), 103-107.

DEPARTMENT OF PURE MATHEMATICS, FACULTY OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, UNIVERSITY OF GUILAN, P. O. BOX 41335-19141, RASHT, IRAN.

E-mail address: `ansari@guilan.ac.ir`

UNIVERSITY OF FARHANGIAN, TEHRAN, IRAN.

E-mail address: `f.farshadifar@gmail.com`

DEPARTMENT OF PURE MATHEMATICS, FACULTY OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, UNIVERSITY OF GUILAN, P. O. BOX 41335-19141, RASHT, IRAN.

E-mail address: `mahboobi@phd.guilan.ac.ir`